



County of San Diego

MARK WARDLAW
DIRECTOR

PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT SERVICES
5510 OVERLAND AVENUE, SUITE 310, SAN DIEGO, CA 92123
(858) 694-2962 • Fax (858) 694-2555
www.sdcounty.ca.gov/pds

KATHLEEN A. FLANNERY
ASSISTANT DIRECTOR

Statement of Reasons for Exemption from Additional Environmental Review and 15183 Checklist Pursuant to CEQA Guidelines §15183

Date: April 5, 2018
Project Title: Terrace Hill Tentative Map
Record ID: PDS2015-TM-5599, PDS2015-ER-15-14-001
Plan Area: Lakeside Community Plan Area
GP Designation: Village Residential (VR-4.3)
Density: 4.3 dwelling units per acre
Zoning: RS (Single Family Residential)
Min. Lot Size: 10,000 square feet
Special Area Reg.: C
Lot Size: 2.85 acres
Applicant: Eric Crouther, REC Consultants, Inc. - (951) 693-2400
Staff Contact: Michelle Chan - (858) 495-5428
michelle.chan@sdcounty.ca.gov

Project Description

The project is a Tentative Map to subdivide 2.85 acres into nine residential lots. The project site is located on Terrace Hill Drive in the Lakeside Community Planning Area, within unincorporated San Diego County. Access to the project site will be provided by a new private road connecting to Terrace Hill Drive. The project will be served by imported water from the Helix Water District, and sewer will be provided by the San Diego County Sanitation District. Earthwork will consist of a balanced cut and fill of 9,980 cubic yards of material.

The project site is subject to the Village General Plan Regional Category and Village Residential (VR-4.3) Land Use Designation. Zoning for the site is Single Family Residential (RS). The project is consistent with the requirements of the General Plan and Zoning Ordinance.

Overview

California Public Resources Code section 21083.3 and California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines Section 15183 provide an exemption from additional environmental review for projects that are consistent with the development density established by existing zoning, community plan or general plan policies for which an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) was certified, except as might be necessary to examine whether there are project-specific significant effects which are peculiar to the project or its site. Section 15183 specifies that examination of environmental effects shall be limited to those effects that: (1) Are peculiar to the project or the parcel on which the project will be located, and were not

analyzed as significant effects in a prior EIR on the zoning action, general plan, or community plan, with which the project is consistent, (2) Are potentially significant off-site impacts and cumulative impacts which were not discussed in the prior EIR prepared for the general plan, community plan or zoning action, or (3) Are previously identified significant effects which, as a result of substantial new information which was not known at the time the EIR was certified, are determined to have a more severe adverse impact than discussed in the prior EIR. Section 15183(c) further specifies that if an impact is not peculiar to the parcel or to the proposed project, has been addressed as a significant effect in the prior EIR, or can be substantially mitigated by the imposition of uniformly applied development policies or standards, then an additional EIR need not be prepared for that project solely on the basis of that impact.

General Plan Update Program EIR

The County of San Diego General Plan Update (GPU) establishes a blueprint for future land development in the unincorporated County that meets community desires and balances the environmental protection goals with the need for housing, agriculture, infrastructure, and economic vitality. The GPU applies to all of the unincorporated portions of San Diego County and directs population growth and plans for infrastructure needs, development, and resource protection. The GPU included adoption of new General Plan elements, which set the goals and policies that guide future development. It also included a corresponding land use map, a County Road Network map, updates to Community and Subregional Plans, an Implementation Plan, and other implementing policies and ordinances. The GPU focuses population growth in the western areas of the County where infrastructure and services are available in order to reduce the potential for growth in the eastern areas. The objectives of this population distribution strategy are to: 1) facilitate efficient, orderly growth by containing development within areas potentially served by the San Diego County Water Authority (SDCWA) or other existing infrastructure; 2) protect natural resources through the reduction of population capacity in sensitive areas; and 3) retain or enhance the character of communities within the unincorporated County. The SDCWA service area covers approximately the western one third of the unincorporated County. The SDWCA boundary generally represents where water and wastewater infrastructure currently exist. This area is more developed than the eastern areas of the unincorporated County, and will accommodate more growth under the GPU.

The GPU EIR was certified in conjunction with adoption of the GPU on August 3, 2011. The GPU EIR comprehensively evaluated environmental impacts that will result from Plan implementation, including information related to existing site conditions, analyses of the types and magnitude of project-level and cumulative environmental impacts, and feasible mitigation measures that could reduce or avoid environmental impacts.

Summary of Findings

The Rancho Sierra Tentative Map is consistent with the analysis performed for the GPU EIR. Further, the GPU EIR adequately anticipated and described the impacts of the proposed project, identified applicable mitigation measures necessary to reduce project specific impacts, and the project implements these mitigation measures (see https://www.sandiegocounty.gov/content/dam/sdc/pds/gpupdate/docs/BOS_Aug2011/EIR/FEIR_7.00_-_Mitigation_Measures_2011.pdf for complete list of GPU Mitigation Measures).

A comprehensive environmental evaluation has been completed for the project as documented in the attached §15183 Exemption Checklist. This evaluation concludes that the project qualifies for an exemption from additional environmental review because it is consistent with the development density and use characteristics established by the County of San Diego General Plan, as analyzed by the San Diego County General Plan Update Final Program EIR (GPU EIR, ER #02-ZA-001, SCH #2002111067), and all required findings can be made.

In accordance with CEQA Guidelines §15183, the project qualifies for an exemption because the following findings can be made:

1. The project is consistent with the development density established by existing zoning, community plan or general plan policies for which an EIR was certified.

The project will subdivide a 2.8-acre property into nine lots, which is consistent with the Village Residential (VR-4.3) development density established by the General Plan and the certified GPU EIR.

2. There are no project specific effects which are peculiar to the project or its site, and which the GPU EIR failed to analyze as significant effects.

The subject property is no different than other properties in the surrounding area, and there are no project specific effects which are peculiar to the project or its site. The project site is located in an area developed with similarly sized, single family residential lots with associated accessory uses. The property does not support any peculiar environmental features, and the project will not result in any peculiar effects.

In addition, as explained further in the 15183 Checklist below, all project impacts were adequately analyzed by the GPU EIR. The project could result in potentially significant impacts to biological and paleontological resources. However, applicable mitigation measures specified within the GPU EIR have been made conditions of approval for this project.

3. There are no potentially significant off-site and/or cumulative impacts which the GPU EIR failed to evaluate.

The proposed project is consistent with the density and use characteristics of the development considered by the GPU EIR and will represent a small part of the growth that was forecast for build-out of the General Plan. The GPU EIR considered the incremental impacts of the proposed project, and as explained further in the 15183 Exemption Checklist below, no potentially significant off-site or cumulative impacts have been identified which were not previously evaluated.

4. There is no substantial new information which results in more severe impacts than anticipated by the GPU EIR.

As explained in the 15183 exemption checklist below, no new information has been identified which will result in a determination of a more severe impact than what had been anticipated by the GPU EIR.

5. The project will undertake feasible mitigation measures specified in the GPU EIR.

As explained in the 15183 exemption checklist below, the project will undertake feasible mitigation measures specified in the GPU EIR. These GPU EIR mitigation measures will be undertaken through project design, compliance with regulations and ordinances, or through the project's conditions of approval.

| | |
|--|---------------------------------------|
| <hr/> Signature | <hr/> April 5, 2018 Date |
| <hr/> Michelle Chan Printed Name | <hr/> Project Manager Title |

CEQA Guidelines §15183 Exemption Checklist

Overview

This checklist provides an analysis of potential environmental impacts resulting from the proposed project. Following the format of CEQA Guidelines Appendix G, environmental effects are evaluated to determine if the project will result in a potentially significant impact triggering additional review under Guidelines section 15183.

- Items checked “Significant Project Impact” indicates that the project could result in a significant effect which either requires mitigation to be reduced to a less than significant level or which has a significant, unmitigated impact.
- Items checked “Impact not identified by GPU EIR” indicates the project will result in a project specific significant impact (peculiar off-site or cumulative that was not identified in the GPU EIR).
- Items checked “Substantial New Information” indicates that there is new information which leads to a determination that a project impact is more severe than what had been anticipated by the GPU EIR.

A project does not qualify for a §15183 exemption if it is determined that it will result in: 1) a peculiar impact that was not identified as a significant impact under the GPU EIR; 2) a more severe impact due to new information; or 3) a potentially significant off-site impact or cumulative impact not discussed in the GPU EIR.

A summary of staff’s analysis of each potential environmental effect is provided below the checklist for each subject area. A list of references, significance guidelines, and technical studies used to support the analysis is attached in Appendix A. Appendix B contains a list of GPU EIR mitigation measures.

| | Significant Project Impact | Impact not identified by GPU EIR | Substantial New Information |
|--|----------------------------------|---|-----------------------------------|
| 1. AESTHETICS – Will the Project: | | | |
| a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| c) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare, which will adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

Discussion

- 1(a) The project will be visible from multiple public roads and surrounding public viewpoints; however, the site is not located within the viewshed of a scenic vista and the proposed residential use is consistent with surrounding development. Therefore, the proposed project will not have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista.
- 1(b) The property is not within the viewshed of a County or state scenic highway. The project site also does not support any significant scenic resources that will be lost or modified through development of the property.
- 1(c) The project will be consistent with existing community character. The project is located in an area characterized by residential uses on similar sized lots. Therefore, the addition of nine new residential lots will not substantially degrade the visual quality of the site or its surroundings.
- 1(d) Residential lighting will be required to conform with the County's Light Pollution Code to prevent spillover onto adjacent properties and to minimize any new substantial sources of light. Therefore, the proposed project will not adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area.

Conclusion

As discussed above, the project will not result in any significant impacts to aesthetics; therefore, the project will not result in an impact which was not adequately evaluated by the GPU EIR.

| | Significant Project Impact | Impact not identified by GPU EIR | Substantial New Information |
|--|----------------------------------|---|-----------------------------------|
| 2. Agriculture/Forestry Resources – Will the Project: | | | |
| a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide or Local Importance as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, or other agricultural resources, to a non-agricultural use? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| c) Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land, timberland, or timberland zoned Timberland Production? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| d) Result in the loss of forest land, conversion of forest land to non-forest use, or involve other changes in the existing environment, which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of forest land to non-forest use? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| e) Involve other changes in the existing environment, which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Important Farmland or other agricultural resources, to non-agricultural use? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

Discussion

- 2(a) The project site and surrounding properties do not support any Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide or Local Importance. The project site does not contain agricultural resources as defined by the County of San Diego's Guidelines for Determining Significance for Agricultural Resources. Therefore, the proposed project will not convert agricultural resources to a non-agricultural use.
- 2(b) The project site is not located within or adjacent to a Williamson Act contract. The property is zoned RS, Single Family Residential. Therefore, the project will not conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use or a Williamson Act contract.
- 2(c) There are no timberland production zones on or near the proposed project site.
- 2(d) The project site is not located near any forest lands. Therefore, the proposed project will not result in the loss or conversion of forest lands.
- 2(e) The project site is located adjacent to existing residential properties. The project site is not located adjacent to any properties that are considered Important Farmland or other active agricultural production areas. Therefore, the proposed project will not result in changes to the existing environment which could result in the conversion of Important Farmland or other agricultural resources to non-agricultural uses.

Conclusion

As discussed above, the project will not result in any significant impacts to agricultural resources; therefore, the project will not result in an impact which was not adequately evaluated by the GPU EIR.

| | Significant Project Impact | Impact not identified by GPU EIR | Substantial New Information |
|---|---|---|--|
| 3. Air Quality – Will the Project: | | | |
| a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the San Diego Regional Air Quality Strategy (RAQS) or applicable portions of the State Implementation Plan (SIP)? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| c) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

Discussion

- 3(a) No. The project is zoned Village Residential (VR-4.3) which has an allowable density of 4.3 units per acre. The project proposes nine single-family residential units on a 2.85-acre area and would be consistent with the County of San Diego General Plan and the RAQS. As such, the project would not conflict with either the RAQS or SIP. In addition, construction and operational emissions from the project are anticipated to be below established screening-level thresholds (SLTs), as addressed under Question 3(b) below, and would not violate any ambient air quality standards.
- 3(b) No. Earthwork consists of balanced grading (i.e., no soil import or export) totaling 2.85 acres and 9,980 cubic yards of soil. Short-term construction activities would result from fuel combustion and exhaust from construction equipment and vehicle traffic (i.e., worker commute and delivery truck trips), grading and site work, and evaporative emissions of volatile organic compounds (VOCs) from architectural coatings and paving. Emissions from the construction phase would be minimal, temporary and localized. Additionally, grading operations associated with the construction of the project would be subject to County of San Diego Grading Ordinance, which requires the implementation of dust control measures and San Diego Air Pollution Control District (SDAPCD) Rule 55. SDAPCD Rule 55 requires the implementation of dust control measures such as application of water to graded/exposed surfaces and during loading/unloading activities,

wheel-washing or other means to minimize track out dust on vehicles entering/leaving the project site, stabilization of dirt piles, and hydroseeding of graded areas to minimize dust emissions from exposed surfaces. Long-term operational activities would result from mobile sources and area sources, such as landscaping, consumer products, and architectural coatings. The project would use architectural coatings that are compliance with SDAPCD Rule 67.0, which limits VOC content to 150 grams per liter (g/l) for exterior paints and 100 g/l for interior paints.

The County has established Guidelines for Determining Significance of Air Quality Impacts which incorporate the SDAPCD's established significance level thresholds for all New Source Review (NSR) in SDAPCD Rule 20.2 and Rule 20.3. The Guidelines and Report Format and Content Requirements (County Guidelines) can be found at <http://www.sandiegocounty.gov/content/dam/sdc/pds/ProjectPlanning/docs/AQ-Guidelines.pdf> and at <http://www.sandiegocounty.gov/content/dam/sdc/pds/ProjectPlanning/docs/AQ-Report-Format.pdf>. These SLTs can be used as numeric methods to demonstrate that a project's total emissions (e.g. stationary and fugitive emissions, as well as emissions from mobile sources) would not result in a significant impact to air quality. Since SDAPCD does not have a SLT for emissions of VOCs, the screening level from the South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) for the Coachella Valley (which is more appropriate for the San Diego Air Basin) is used.

According to County Guidelines, grading activities trigger the SLTs if more than 3.5 acres is disturbed in a single day. Grading would total 2.85 acres; therefore, grading activities would not exceed 3.5 acres in a single day, which is less than the screening criterion. For projects of this size, it is presumed that construction air quality emissions would not exceed the SLTs. Operational emissions trigger the SLTs if the project produces more than 300 single family units or 370 apartments or condominiums. The project is a nine-unit single family development and would fall below the screening criterion of 300 units. Project operations would result in 108 average daily trips (ADTs). Operational air quality emissions would not exceed the SLTs.

In summary, project construction and operational emissions are not anticipated to exceed the County's construction and operational SLTs. Therefore, the project will not violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation.

- 3(c) No. San Diego County is presently in non-attainment for the national ambient air quality standard (NAAQS) and California ambient air quality standard (CAAQS) for ozone (O_3). San Diego County is also in non-attainment for the annual geometric mean and for the 24-hour concentrations of particulate matter less than or equal to 10 microns (PM_{10}) and particulate matter less than or equal to 2.5 microns ($PM_{2.5}$) under the CAAQS. O_3 is formed when VOCs and oxides of nitrogen (NO_x) react in the presence of sunlight. Sources of VOCs include any source that burns fuels (e.g., gasoline, natural gas, wood, oil); solvents; petroleum processing and storage; and pesticides. Sources of PM_{10} in both urban and rural areas include motor vehicles, wood burning stoves and fireplaces, dust from construction, landfills, agriculture, wildfires, brush/waste burning, and industrial sources of windblown dust from open lands. Emissions of $PM_{2.5}$ are dominated by emissions from area sources, primarily fugitive dust from vehicle travel on unpaved and paved roads, construction and demolition, and particles from residential fuel combustion.

The project would contribute PM_{10} , $PM_{2.5}$, NO_x , and VOC emissions from construction/grading activities; however, the incremental increase would not exceed

established SLTs (see Question 3(b) above). Additionally, grading activities associated with construction of the project would be subject to County of San Diego Grading Ordinance, which requires implementation of dust control measures and SDAPCD Rule 55. Emissions from the construction phase would be localized and temporary resulting in PM₁₀, PM_{2.5}, NO_x, and VOC emissions below the SLTs established by the County Guidelines. In addition, project operational emissions would not be anticipated to exceed the County's SLTs.

In addition, a list of past, present and future projects within the surrounding area were evaluated and none of these projects emit significant amounts of criteria pollutants. Refer to XVIII. Mandatory Findings of Significance for a comprehensive list of the projects considered. The proposed project as well as the past, present and future projects within the surrounding area, have emissions below the SLTs established by the County Guidelines; therefore, the construction and operational-related emissions associated with the proposed project are not expected to create a cumulatively considerable impact nor a considerable net increase of PM₁₀, PM_{2.5}, or any O₃ precursors.

The project would contribute PM₁₀, PM_{2.5}, NO_x, and VOC emissions from construction and operational activities; however, the incremental increase would not exceed established SLTs (see Question 3(b) above).

- 3(d) No. As discussed in Question 3(b) above, project implementation would not result in regional (e.g., VOC, NO_x, PM₁₀, PM_{2.5}) or local (e.g., carbon monoxide [CO]) emissions of criteria air pollutants or precursors from construction or operational-related activities that would exceed SLTs. Thus, project-generated criteria air pollutant and precursor emissions would not expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations.

The project proposes to construct nine new single-family homes, which is considered a new sensitive receptor; however, the project site is not located within a quarter-mile of any identified point source of significant emissions or high-volume roadway. Similarly, the project does not propose uses or activities that would result in exposure of these sensitive receptors to significant pollutant concentrations and will not place sensitive receptors near any CO hotspots.

- 3(e) No. The project could produce temporary objectionable odors during construction. Odorous emissions disperse rapidly with increasing distance from the source and due to the small scale of construction activities, emissions would be minimal and temporary, ceasing once construction is complete. Therefore, construction related odors would not result in a new odor source that could adversely affect a substantial number of individuals. The project proposes single family homes that would not introduce any permanent odor sources associated with operations. Therefore, considering that construction activities would be limited to the daytime hours, when people are likely not at home, would be temporary, and would disperse with increasing distance from the source, construction-related odors would not affect a substantial number of people. Moreover, the effects of objectionable odors are localized to the immediate surrounding area and will not contribute to a cumulatively considerable odor impact.

The project is not an agricultural, commercial, or an industrial activity that will generate objectionable odors or place sensitive receptors next to existing objectionable odors, which will affect a considerable number of persons or the public.

Conclusion

As discussed above, the project will not result in any significant impacts to air quality; therefore, the project will not result in an impact which was not adequately evaluated by the GPU EIR.

| | Significant Project Impact | Impact not identified by GPU EIR | Substantial New Information |
|--|---|---|--|
| 4. Biological Resources – Will the Project: | | | |
| a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or US Fish and Wildlife Service? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| c) Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| e) Conflict with the provisions of any adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Communities Conservation Plan, other approved local, regional or state habitat conservation plan or any other local policies or ordinances that protect biological resources? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

Discussion

- 4(a) Biological resources on the project site were evaluated in a Biological Resources Letter Report prepared by REC Consultants, dated June 2015. The site contains 0.7 acres of non-native grassland and 2.14 acres of non-native vegetation, disturbed lands, and developed lands. Impacts will occur to the 0.7 acres of non-native grassland. No special-status animal or plant species were observed on the project site. The site is located within the Multiple Species Conservation Program (MSCP) boundary, but is not designated as a Pre-approved Mitigation Area (PAMA) or a Biological Resource Core Area (BRCA).

As considered by the GPU EIR, project impacts to sensitive habitat and/or species will be mitigated through ordinance compliance and through implementation of the following mitigation measures: preservation of 0.35 acres of Tier III habitat (chaparral or non-native grassland) located within the MSCP and breeding season avoidance to prevent brushing, clearing, and/or grading during February 15th and August 31st. The GPU EIR identified these mitigation measures as Bio 1.5 and Bio 1.6.

- 4(b) Based on the Biological Resources Report, no wetlands or jurisdictional waters were found on-site or off-site. Non-native grasslands were identified on the site. As detailed in response a) above, project impacts to sensitive habitat and/or species will be mitigated through ordinance compliance and through implementation of the following mitigation measures: preservation of 0.35 acres of Tier III habitat (chaparral or non-native grassland) located within the MSCP and breeding season avoidance to prevent brushing, clearing, and/or grading during February 15th and August 31st. The GPU EIR identified these mitigation measures as Bio 1.5 and Bio 1.6.
- 4(c) Based on the Biological Resources Letter Report, the proposed project site does not contain any wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act. Therefore, the proposed project will not have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands.
- 4(d) Based on a GIS analysis, the County's Comprehensive Matrix of Sensitive Species, site photos, a site visit by County staff, and the Biological Resources Letter Report, it was determined that the project site is not part of a regional linkage/corridor as identified on MSCP maps nor is it in an area considered regionally important for wildlife dispersal. The site will not assist in local wildlife movement as it surrounded by residential development and lacks connecting vegetation and visual continuity with other potential habitat areas in the general project vicinity. Therefore, the project will not interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites.
- 4(e) The project is consistent with the MSCP, Biological Mitigation Ordinance, and Resource Protection Ordinance (RPO) because off-site mitigation will be required to compensate for the loss of significant habitat.

Conclusion

The project could result in potentially significant impacts to biological resources; however, further environmental analysis is not required because:

1. No peculiar impacts to the project or its site have been identified.
2. There are no potentially significant off-site and/or cumulative impacts which were not discussed by the GPU EIR.
3. No substantial new information has been identified which results in an impact which is more severe than anticipated by the GPU EIR.
4. Feasible mitigation measures contained within the GPU EIR, identified as Bio 1.5 and Bio 1.6, will be applied to the project.

| | Significant Project Impact | Impact not identified by GPU EIR | Substantial New Information |
|--|----------------------------------|---|-----------------------------------|
| 5. Cultural Resources – Will the Project: | | | |
| a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in 15064.5? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to 15064.5? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique geologic feature? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| d) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| e) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

Discussion

- 5(a) A cultural and historical resources study was completed for the proposed project titled "Class III Cultural Resources Survey for the Terrace Hill Drive project, Unincorporated Lakeside, San Diego County, California" dated September 2015 by Jerry Schaefer, Ph.D. It has been determined that there are no historical resources within the proposed project area. Therefore, the proposed project will not cause a substantial change in the significance of a historical resource.
- 5(b) A cultural and historical resources study was completed for the proposed project. No archaeological resources were identified, and the project site exhibited heavy to moderate disturbance throughout. Based on an analysis of the existing disturbance and soils within the project site, it was determined that unknown, subsurface resources are not anticipated. In addition, based on an analysis of records and Native American tribal outreach, it has been determined that tribal cultural resources are not present within the project site. Therefore, the proposed project will not cause a substantial change in the significance of an archaeological resource. As considered by the GPU EIR, potential impacts to unanticipated, buried, cultural resources will be mitigated through compliance with the Grading Ordinance and through conformance with the County's Cultural Resource Guidelines if resources are encountered.
- 5(c) The site does not contain any unique geologic features that have been listed in the County's Guidelines for Determining Significance for Unique Geology Resources nor does the site support any known geologic characteristics that have the potential to support unique geologic features.
- 5(d) A review of the County's Paleontological Resources Maps and data on San Diego County's geologic formations indicates that the project is located on Upper Jurassic and Lower Cretaceous Marine and Non-Marine formations that have a marginal potential to contain unique paleontological resources. Proposed grading will include more than 2,500 cubic yards of excavation which has the potential to impact fossil deposits. Accordingly, grading monitoring will be a condition of project approval.

As considered by the GPU EIR, potential impacts to paleontological resources will be mitigated through ordinance compliance and through implementation of the following mitigation measures: grading monitoring by the grading contractor and conformance with the County's Cultural Resource Guidelines if resources are encountered. The GPU EIR identified these mitigation measures as Cul-3.1.

- 5(e) Based on an analysis of records and archaeological surveys of the property, it has been determined that the project site does not include a formal cemetery or any archaeological resources that might contain interred human remains.

Conclusion

The project could result in potentially significant impacts to cultural resources; however, further environmental analysis is not required because:

1. No peculiar impacts to the project or its site have been identified.
2. There are no potentially significant off-site and/or cumulative impacts which were not discussed by the GPU EIR.
3. No substantial new information has been identified which results in an impact which is more severe than anticipated by the GPU EIR.
4. Feasible mitigation measures contained within the GPU EIR, identified as Cul-3.1, will be applied to the project.

| | Significant Project Impact | Impact not identified by GPU EIR | Substantial New Information |
|--|---|---|--|
|--|---|---|--|

6. Geology and Soils – Will the Project:

a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving: rupture of a known earthquake fault, strong seismic ground shaking, seismic-related ground failure, liquefaction, and/or landslides?

☐
☐
☐

b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?

☐
☐
☐

c) Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that will become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in an on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?

☐
☐
☐

d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property?

☐
☐
☐

e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal

☐
☐
☐

systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater?

Discussion

- 6(a)(i) The project site is not located in a fault rupture hazard zone identified by the Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Act, Special Publication 42, Revised 1997, Fault-Rupture Hazards Zones in California, or located within any other area with substantial evidence of a known fault. Therefore, the proposed project will not expose people or structures to potential adverse effects involving: rupture of a known earthquake fault, strong seismic ground shaking, seismic-related ground failure, liquefaction, and/or landslides.
- 6(a)(ii) To ensure the structural integrity of all buildings and structures, the proposed project must conform to the Seismic Requirements as outlined within the California Building Code. Compliance with the California Building Code and the County Building Code will ensure that the project will not result in a significant impact.
- 6(a)(iii) The project site is not within a "Potential Liquefaction Area" as identified in the County Guidelines for Determining Significance for Geologic Hazards. In addition, the site is not underlain by poor artificial fill or located within a floodplain.
- 6(a)(iv) The project site is located in a landslide susceptibility area considered to be generally susceptible to land sliding. However, based on the absence of significant slopes within the project site, the potential for slope failures can be considered negligible.
- 6(b) According to the Soil Survey of San Diego County, the soils on-site are identified as Vista coarse sandy loam that have a moderate soil erodibility rating. However, the project will not result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil because the project will be required to comply with the Watershed Protection Ordinance (WPO) and Grading Ordinance which will ensure that the project will not result in any unprotected erodible soils, will not alter existing drainage patterns, and will not develop steep slopes. Additionally, the project will be required to implement Best Management Practices (BMPs) to prevent fugitive sediment.
- 6(c) The project site is not located on or near geological formations that are unstable or will potentially become unstable as a result of the project. Furthermore, the project will be required to comply with the WPO and Grading Ordinance which will ensure that the project will not result in any unprotected erodible soils and will not develop steep slopes that could cause landslides, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction, or collapse.
- 6(d) The project site is not underlain by expansive soils as defined within Table 18-I-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994). The proposed project will comply with the Building Code and implement standard engineering techniques to ensure structural safety. Therefore, the project will not result in substantial risks to life or property from expansive soils.
- 6(e) The proposed project will utilize sewer from the San Diego County Sanitation District. No septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems are proposed.

Conclusion

As discussed above, the project will not result in any significant impacts to/from geology/soils; therefore, the project will not result in an impact which was not adequately evaluated by the GPU EIR.

| | Significant Project Impact | Impact not identified by GPU EIR | Substantial New Information |
|--|----------------------------------|--|--------------------------------|
| 7. Greenhouse Gas Emissions – Will the Project: | | | |
| a) Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| b) Conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

Discussion

7(a) The proposed project will produce greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions through construction activities, vehicle trips, and residential fuel combustion. The annual 900 metric ton carbon dioxide equivalent (MT CO₂e) screening level referenced in the California Air Pollution Control Officers Association (CAPCOA) white paper is used as a conservative screening criterion for determining which projects require further analysis and identification of project design features or potential mitigation measures with regards to GHG emissions. The proposed project falls below the size-based screening criteria that were developed to identify project types and sizes that will have less than cumulatively considerable GHG emissions (i.e., the project will result in less than 50 single-family residential units). The screening criteria are based on various land use densities and project types. Projects that meet or fall below the screening thresholds are expected to result in 900 MT per year of GHG emissions or less and would not require additional analysis. The County of San Diego Board of Supervisors adopted the Climate Action Plan (CAP) on February 14, 2018. The CAP was prepared pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15183.5 as a qualified plan for reduction of GHG emissions, which allows development applicants to use CEQA streamlining tools for analysis of GHG emissions and related impacts for projects that are consistent with the CAP. A project would have a less than significant cumulatively considerable contribution to climate change impacts if it is found to be consistent with the CAP. The CAP Consistency Review Checklist (Checklist) provides a streamlined CEQA review process for discretionary development projects that are consistent with the General Plan density/intensity to determine consistency with the CAP. The following specific applicable requirements outlined in the Checklist, shall be required as a condition of project approval:

- Install an electric or alternatively-fueled water heating system (e.g., solar thermal water heater, tankless electric water heater, storage electric water heater, electric heat pump water heater, tankless gas water heater, other);
- The maximum flow rate of kitchen faucets shall not exceed 1.5 gallons per minute at 60 psi;
- Install at least one qualified Energy Star dishwasher or clothes washer per residential dwelling unit;
- Avail of incentives to Install one rain barrel per every 500 square feet of available roof area;
- Submit a Landscape Document Package that is compliant with the County's water Conservation in Landscaping Ordinance and demonstrates a 40 percent reduction in current Maximum Applied Water Allowance for outdoor use; and
- Plant, at a minimum, two trees per every residential dwelling unit.

The project proposes a nine lot subdivision that will allow a maximum of nine dwelling units and therefore will fall below the screening criteria of 50 units. For projects of this size, it is presumed that the construction and operational GHG emissions would not exceed 900 MT CO₂e per year. The project would be required to comply with the most recent California Building Code regulations at the time of building permit. Furthermore, the project would be consistent with the CAP, which is determined through the Checklist; therefore, the project would not result in a significant impact due to GHG emissions.

- 7(b) As described above, the project would not result in a cumulatively considerable contribution to global climate change. The project complies with the applicable requirements outlined in the CAP Consistency Review Checklist; therefore, the project is consistent with the CAP. Because the project is consistent with the density allowed in the General Plan, it would be consistent with the SANDAG Regional Plan. Thus, the project would not conflict with any applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing emissions of GHGs.

Conclusion

As discussed above, the proposed project will not result in any significant impacts to greenhouse gas emissions; therefore, the project will not result in an impact which was not adequately evaluated by the GPU EIR.

| | Significant Project Impact | Impact not identified by GPU EIR | Substantial New Information |
|--|----------------------------------|--|-----------------------------------|
|--|----------------------------------|--|-----------------------------------|

8. Hazards and Hazardous Materials – Will the Project:

a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, storage, use, or disposal of hazardous materials or wastes or through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?

☐
☐
☐

b) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?

☐
☐
☐

c) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5, or is otherwise known to have been subject to a release of hazardous substances and, as a result, will it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?

☐
☐
☐

d) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, will the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?

☐
☐
☐

- e) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, will the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area? ☐ ☐ ☐
- f) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan? ☐ ☐ ☐
- g)Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands? ☐ ☐ ☐
- h) Propose a use, or place residents adjacent to an existing or reasonably foreseeable use that will substantially increase current or future resident's exposure to vectors, including mosquitoes, rats or flies, which are capable of transmitting significant public health diseases or nuisances? ☐ ☐ ☐

Discussion

- 8(a) The proposed project will not create a significant hazard to the public or the environment because it does not propose the storage, use, transport, emission, or disposal of Hazardous Substances, nor are Hazardous Substances proposed or currently in use in the immediate vicinity. In addition, the project does not propose to demolish any existing structures on-site which could produce a hazard related to the release of asbestos, lead based paint or other hazardous materials.
- 8(b) The proposed project will not emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste. The project site is also not located within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school.
- 8(c) Based on a site visit and a comprehensive review of regulatory databases, the project site has not been subject to a release of hazardous substances. Additionally, the project does not propose structures for human occupancy or significant linear excavation within 1,000 feet of an open, abandoned, or closed landfill, is not located on or within 250 feet of the boundary of a parcel identified as containing burn ash (from the historic burning of trash), and is not on or within 1,000 feet of a Formerly Used Defense Site. Therefore, the proposed project will not create a significant hazard to the public or the environment.
- 8(d) The project site is located within an Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan (ALUCP) for the Gillespie Airport. However, the proposed project will not result in hazards to airport safety or surrounding land uses because the project will comply with the California Land Use Planning Handbook's Safety Compatibility Criteria for Safety Compatibility Zones and the Airport Land Use Compatibility Policies for the Gillespie Airport. In addition, the proposed project will not create any distracting hazards (e.g. glare, sources of smoke) or construct any structures equal or greater than 150 feet in height that could pose a safety hazard.
- 8(e) The proposed project is not within one mile of a private airstrip. Therefore, the proposed project will not result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area.
- 8(f)(i) OPERATIONAL AREA EMERGENCY PLAN AND MULTI-JURISDICTIONAL HAZARD MITIGATION PLAN: The project will not interfere with this plan because it will not prohibit

subsequent plans from being established or prevent the goals and objectives of existing plans from being carried out.

8(f)(ii) **SAN DIEGO COUNTY NUCLEAR POWER STATION EMERGENCY RESPONSE PLAN:** The property is not within the San Onofre emergency planning zone.

8(f)(iii) **OIL SPILL CONTINGENCY ELEMENT:** The project is not located along the coastal zone.

8(f)(iv) **EMERGENCY WATER CONTINGENCIES ANNEX AND ENERGY SHORTAGE RESPONSE PLAN:** The project will not alter major water or energy supply infrastructure which could interfere with the plan.

8f)(v) **DAM EVACUATION PLAN:** The project is not located within a dam inundation zone.

8(g) The project site is surrounded by residential development; however, wildlands that have the potential to support wildland fires are located in the surrounding area. The project will not expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires because the project will comply with the regulations relating to emergency access, water supply, and defensible space specified in the Consolidated Fire Code. Also, a Fire Service Availability form dated March 2015 has been approved by the Lakeside Fire Protection District which indicates the expected emergency travel time to the project site to be within the maximum travel time allowed by the County Public Facilities Element.

8(h) The project does not involve or support uses that will allow water to stand for a period of 72 hours or more (e.g. artificial lakes, agricultural ponds). Also, the project does not involve or support uses that will produce or collect animal waste, such as equestrian facilities, agricultural operations (chicken coops, dairies etc.), a solid waste facility or other similar uses. Moreover, none of these uses are present on adjacent properties. Therefore, the proposed project will not substantially increase current or future resident's exposure to vectors which are capable of transmitting public health diseases or nuisances.

Conclusion

As discussed above, the proposed project will not result in any significant impacts to/from hazards/hazardous materials; therefore, the project will not result in an impact which was not adequately evaluated by the GPU EIR.

| | Significant Project Impact | Impact not identified by GPU EIR | Substantial New Information |
|--|----------------------------------|--|-----------------------------------|
| 9. Hydrology and Water Quality – Will the Project: | | | |
| a) Violate any waste discharge requirements? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| b) Is the project tributary to an already impaired water body, as listed on the Clean Water Act Section 303(d) list? If so, could the project result in an increase in any pollutant for which the water body is already impaired? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| c) Could the proposed project cause or contribute to an exceedance of applicable surface or groundwater receiving water quality objectives or degradation of beneficial uses? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

- | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| d) Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there will be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells will drop to a level which will not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| e) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which will result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| f) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which will result in flooding on- or off-site? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| g) Create or contribute runoff water which will exceed the capacity of existing or planned storm water drainage systems? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| h) Provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| i) Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map, including County Floodplain Maps? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| j) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which will impede or redirect flood flows? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| k) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| l) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| m) Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

Discussion

- 9(a) The project will require a National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) General Permit for Discharges of Storm Water Associated with Construction Activities. A Priority Development Project Stormwater Quality Management Plan (SWQMP) was prepared for the project by REC Consultants (January 2017). The SWQMP demonstrates that the project will comply with all requirements of the Watershed Protection Ordinance (WPO). The project will be required to implement site design measures, source control BMPs, and/or treatment control BMPs to reduce potential pollutants to the maximum extent practicable. These measures will enable the project to meet waste discharge requirements as required by the San Diego Municipal Permit, as implemented by the San

Diego County Jurisdictional Urban Runoff Management Program (JURMP) and Standard Urban Storm Water Mitigation Plan (SUSMP).

- 9(b) The project site lies within the San Diego River hydrolic unit. According to the Clean Water Act Section 303(d) list, a portion of these watersheds are impaired. Constituents of concern in the San Diego River watersheds include coliform bacteria, nutrients, sediment, lowered dissolve oxygen, and trace metals. The project could contribute to release of these pollutants; however, the project will comply with the WPO and implement site design measures, source control BMPs, and treatment control BMPs to prevent a significant increase of pollutants to receiving waters.
- 9(c) As stated in responses 9(a) and 9(b) above, implementation of BMPs and compliance with required ordinances will ensure that project impacts are less than significant.
- 9(d) The project will obtain its water supply from the Helix Water District that obtains water from surface reservoirs or other imported sources. The project will not use any groundwater. In addition, the project does not involve operations that will interfere substantially with groundwater recharge.
- 9(e) A Drainage Study (October 2016) was prepared by REC Consultants for the proposed project. It was determined that the proposed project will not substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the project site or area. As outlined in the project's SWQMP, the project will implement source control and/or treatment control BMP's to reduce potential pollutants, including sediment from erosion or siltation, to the maximum extent practicable from entering storm water runoff.
- 9(f) Based on the results of the Drainage Study by REC Consultants (October 2016), the proposed project will convey drainage to either natural drainage channels or approved drainage facilities. Therefore, the project will not significantly alter established drainage patterns or substantially increase the amount of runoff in a manner which will result in flooding on- or off-site.
- 9(g) The project does not propose to create or contribute runoff water that will exceed the capacity of existing or planned storm water drainage systems.
- 9(h) The project has the potential to generate pollutants; however, site design measures, source control BMPs, and treatment control BMPs will be employed such that potential pollutants will be reduced to the maximum extent practicable.
- 9(i) No FEMA mapped floodplains, County-mapped floodplains or drainages with a watershed greater than 25 acres were identified on the project site or off-site improvement locations.
- 9(j) No 100-year flood hazard areas were identified on the project site or off-site improvement locations.
- 9(k) The project site lies outside any identified special flood hazard area.
- 9(l) The project site lies outside a mapped dam inundation area for a major dam/reservoir within San Diego County. In addition, the project is not located immediately downstream of a minor dam that could potentially flood the property.
- 9(m)(i) SEICHE: The project site is not located along the shoreline of a lake or reservoir.

9(m)(ii) TSUNAMI: The project site is not located in a tsunami hazard zone.

9(m)(iii) MUDFLOW: Mudflow is type of landslide. See response to question 6(a)(iv).

Conclusion

As discussed above, the project will not result in any significant impacts to/from hydrology/water quality; therefore, the project will not result in an impact which was not adequately evaluated by the GPU EIR.

| | Significant Project Impact | Impact not identified by GPU EIR | Substantial New Information |
|---|----------------------------------|--|-----------------------------------|
| 10. Land Use and Planning – Will the Project: | | | |
| a) Physically divide an established community? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| b) Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

Discussion

10(a) The project does not propose the introduction of new infrastructure such as major roadways, water supply systems, or utilities to the area that will physically divide the existing community.

10(b) The proposed project will not conflict with any land use plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect, including policies of the General Plan and Community Plan.

Conclusion

As discussed above, the project will not result in any significant impacts to land use/planning; therefore, the project will not result in an impact which was not adequately evaluated by the GPU EIR.

| | Significant Project Impact | Impact not identified by GPU EIR | Substantial New Information |
|---|----------------------------------|--|-----------------------------------|
| 11. Mineral Resources – Will the Project: | | | |
| a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that will be of value to the region and the residents of the state? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

b) Result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?

☐☐☐

11(a) The project site has been classified by the California Department of Conservation Division of Mines and Geology as "Resources Potentially Present" (MRZ-3). However, the project site is surrounded by residential development which is incompatible to future extraction of mineral resources on the project site. A future mining operation at the project site will likely create a significant impact to neighboring properties for issues such as noise, air quality, traffic, and possibly other impacts. Therefore, the project will not result in the loss of a known mineral resource because the resource has already been lost due to incompatible land uses.

11(b) The project site is not located in an Extractive Use Zone (S-82), nor does it have an Impact Sensitive Land Use Designation (24) with an Extractive Land Use Overlay (25). Therefore, the proposed project will not result in the loss of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site.

Conclusion

As discussed above, the project will not result in any significant impacts to mineral resources; therefore, the project will not result in an impact which was not adequately evaluated by the GPU EIR.

| | Significant Project Impact | Impact not identified by GPU EIR | Substantial New Information |
|--|----------------------------------|---|-----------------------------------|
|--|----------------------------------|---|-----------------------------------|

12. Noise – Will the Project:

a) Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?

☐☐☐

b) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?

☐☐☐

c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?

☐☐☐

d) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?

☐☐☐

e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, will the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?

☐☐☐

f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, will the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?

☐
☐
☐

Discussion

12(a) The proposed project will not expose people to potentially significant noise levels that exceed the allowable limits of the General Plan, Noise Ordinance, or other applicable standards for the following reasons:

General Plan – Noise Element: Tables N-1 and N-2 addresses noise sensitive areas and requires projects to comply with a Community Noise Equivalent Level (CNEL) of 60 decibels (dBA). Projects which could produce noise in excess of 60 dB(A) are required to incorporate design measures or mitigation as necessary to comply with the Noise Element. Based on a review of the County's noise contour maps, the project is not expected to expose existing or planned noise sensitive areas to noise in excess of 60 dB(A).

Noise Ordinance – Section 36-404: Non-transportation noise generated by the project is not expected to exceed the standards of the Noise Ordinance at or beyond the project's property line. The project does not involve any noise producing equipment that will exceed applicable noise levels at the adjoining property line.

Noise Ordinance – Section 36-409: The project will not generate construction noise in excess of Noise Ordinance standards. Construction operations will occur only during permitted hours of operation. Also, it is not anticipated that the project will operate construction equipment in excess of an average sound level of 75dB between the hours of 7 AM and 7 PM.

12(b) The project proposes residences where low ambient vibration is essential for interior operation and/or sleeping conditions. However, the facilities are typically setback more than 50 feet from any County Mobility Element (ME) roadway using rubber-tired vehicles with projected groundborne noise or vibration contours of 38 VdB or less; any property line for parcels zoned industrial or extractive use; or any permitted extractive uses. A setback of 50 feet from the roadway centerline for heavy-duty truck activities will insure that these proposed uses or operations do not have any chance of being impacted significantly by groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels (Harris, Miller Miller and Hanson Inc., Transit Noise and Vibration Impact Assessment 1995, Rudy Hendriks, Transportation Related Earthborne Vibrations 2002). This setback insures that this project site will not be affected by any future projects that may support sources of groundborne vibration or groundborne noise related to the adjacent roadways.

Furthermore, the project does not propose any major, new or expanded infrastructure such as mass transit, highways or major roadways or intensive extractive industry that could generate excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels and impact vibration sensitive uses in the surrounding area. Therefore, the project will not expose persons to or generate excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels on a project or cumulative level.

12(c) As indicated in the response listed under Section 12(a), the project will not expose existing or planned noise sensitive areas in the vicinity to a substantial permanent increase in noise levels that exceed the allowable limits of any applicable noise standards. Also, the project is not expected to expose existing or planned noise sensitive areas to off-site direct and cumulative noise over existing ambient noise levels.

- 12(d) The project does not involve any operational uses that may create substantial temporary or periodic increases in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity. Also, general construction noise is not expected to exceed the construction noise limits of the Noise Ordinance. Construction operations will occur only during permitted hours of operation. Grading equipment will be spread out over the project site from a range as far as 400 feet away. Combined grading operations will be more than 100 feet away from the adjacent property lines. Construction equipment near the property lines will be intermittent and limited to the cutting of slopes and final pad preparation. Grading activities with the distance of over 90 feet are not anticipated to exceed the 75 dBA eight hour average requirement and will not require any mitigation measures.
- 12(e) The project is located within an Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan (ALUCP) for the Gillespie Airport. Pursuant to Section 2.11.5 of the Gillespie ALUCP, the proposed project will comply with ALUCP measures for addressing excessive noise levels as it requires the applicant to obtain an aviation easement over the property. The aviation easement shall: 1) Provide the right of flight in the airspace above the property; 2) Allow the generation of noise and other impacts associated with aircraft overflight; 3) Restrict the height of structures, trees, and other objects; 4) Permit access to the property for the removal or aeronautical marking of objects exceeding the established height limit; and 5) Prohibit electrical interference, glare, and other potential hazards to flight from being created on the property. Additionally, pursuant to Section 3.2.2 of the Gillespie ALUCP, the proposed use on the property complies with Airport Influence Area 2, which evaluates factors such as noise, safety, airspace protection, and overflight. Therefore, the proposed project will not expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels.
- 12(f) The project is not located within a one-mile vicinity of a private airstrip.

Conclusion

As discussed above, the project will not result in any significant impacts to/from noise; therefore, the project will not result in an impact which was not adequately evaluated by the GPU EIR.

| Significant Project Impact | Impact not identified by GPU EIR | Substantial New Information |
|----------------------------------|--|-----------------------------------|
|----------------------------------|--|-----------------------------------|

13. Population and Housing – Will the Project:

a) Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?

☐
☐
☐

b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?

☐
☐
☐

c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?

☐
☐
☐

Discussion

- 13(a) The project proposes a residential subdivision of nine lots, which is consistent with the development density analyzed by the GPU EIR for this site. As such, while the project does propose new homes, the addition of nine homes and associated infrastructure extensions will not induce substantial population growth in the area.
- 13(b) There is no existing housing on the project site; therefore, the project will not displace existing housing.
- 13(c) The proposed project will not displace a substantial number of people since the site is currently vacant.

Conclusion

As discussed above, the project will not result in any significant impacts to populations/housing; therefore, the project will not result in an impact which was not adequately evaluated by the GPU EIR.

| Significant Project Impact | Impact not identified by GPU EIR | Substantial New Information |
|----------------------------------|--|-----------------------------------|
|----------------------------------|--|-----------------------------------|

14. Public Services – Will the Project:

a) Result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance service ratios for fire protection, police protection, schools, parks, or other public facilities?

☐
☐
☐

Discussion

- 14(a) Based on the project's service availability forms, the project will not result in the need for significantly altered services or facilities.

Conclusion

As discussed above, the project will not result in any significant impacts to public services; therefore, the project will not result in an impact which was not adequately evaluated by the GPU EIR.

| Significant Project Impact | Impact not identified by GPU EIR | Substantial New Information |
|----------------------------------|--|-----------------------------------|
|----------------------------------|--|-----------------------------------|

15. Recreation – Will the Project:

a) Will the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational

☐
☐
☐

facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility will occur or be accelerated?

b) Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities, which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?

☐☐☐

Discussion

15(a) The project will incrementally increase the use of existing parks and other recreational facilities; however, the project will be required to pay fees pursuant to the Park Land Dedication Ordinance.

15(b) The project does not include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities. Therefore, the construction or expansion of recreational facilities will have an adverse physical effect on the environment.

Conclusion

As discussed above, the project will not result in any significant impacts to recreation; therefore, the project will not result in an impact which was not adequately evaluated by the GPU EIR.

**Significant
Project
Impact**

**Impact
not
identified
by GPU
EIR**

**Substantial
New
Information**

16. Transportation and Traffic – Will the Project:

a) Conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance or policy establishing measures of the effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system, taking into account all modes of transportation including mass transit and non-motorized travel and relevant components of the circulation system, including but not limited to intersections, streets, highways and freeways, pedestrian and bicycle paths and mass transit?

☐☐☐

b) Conflict with an applicable congestion management program, including, but not limited to level of service standards and travel demand measures, or other standards established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?

☐☐☐

c) Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?

☐☐☐

d) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?

☐☐☐

e) Result in inadequate emergency access?

☐☐☐

f) Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs regarding public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities?

☐☐☐

Discussion

- 16(a) The proposed project will result in an additional 108 average daily trips (ADTs), which do not exceed the thresholds established by the County Guidelines for Determining Significance for Transportation and Traffic. The proposed project will not conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance, or policy establishing measures of the effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system. In addition, the project will not conflict with policies related to non-motorized travel such as mass transit, pedestrian or bicycle facilities.
- 16(b) The additional 108 ADTs from the proposed project do not exceed the 2400 trips (or 200 peak hour trips) required for study under the region's Congestion Management Program as developed by SANDAG.
- 16(c) The proposed project is located within the Gillespie Airport Influence Area (AIA) 2. The proposed land use is consistent with the allowable land uses identified for AIA 2 within the ALUCP for the Gillespie Airport. Therefore, the project will not result in a change in air traffic patterns because the allowable land uses within airport safety zones are created for the purpose of ensuring ongoing airport safety, including maintenance of air traffic patterns.
- 16(d) The proposed project will not alter traffic patterns, roadway design, place incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment) on existing roadways, or create curves, slopes or walls which will impede adequate sight distance on a road.
- 16(e) The Lakeside Fire Protection District and the San Diego County Fire Authority have reviewed the project and have determined that there is adequate emergency fire access.
- 16(f) The project will not result in the construction of any road improvements or new road design features that will interfere with the provision of public transit, bicycle or pedestrian facilities. In addition, the project does not generate sufficient travel demand to increase demand for transit, pedestrian or bicycle facilities.

Conclusion

As discussed above, the project will not result in any significant impacts to transportation/traffic; therefore, the project will not result in an impact which was not adequately evaluated by the GPU EIR.

| Significant Project Impact | Impact not identified by GPU EIR | Substantial New Information |
|----------------------------------|--|-----------------------------------|
|----------------------------------|--|-----------------------------------|

17. Utilities and Service Systems – Will the Project:

a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?

☐☐☐

- | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| b) Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| c) Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| e) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider, which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| g) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

Discussion

- 17(a) The project will discharge domestic waste to a community sewer system that is permitted to operate by the Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB). A project Service Availability Form has been received from the San Diego County Sanitation District that indicates that there is adequate capacity to serve the project.
- 17(b) The project involves new water and wastewater pipeline extensions. However, these extensions will not result in additional adverse physical effects beyond those already identified in other sections of this environmental analysis.
- 17(c) The project involves new storm water drainage facilities. However, these drainage facilities will not result in additional adverse physical effects beyond those already identified in other sections of this environmental analysis.
- 17(d) A Service Availability Letter from the Helix Water District has been provided, which indicates that there is adequate water to serve the project.
- 17(e) A Service Availability Letter from the San Diego County Sanitation District has been provided, which indicates that there is adequate wastewater capacity to serve the project.
- 17(f) Implementation of the project will generate solid waste. All solid waste facilities, including landfills require solid waste facility permits to operate. There are five, permitted active landfills in San Diego County with remaining capacity to adequately serve the project.

- 17(g) The project will deposit all solid waste at a permitted solid waste facility. Therefore, the proposed project will comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste.

Conclusion

As discussed above, the project will not result in any significant impacts to utilities and service systems; therefore, the project will not result in an impact which was not adequately evaluated by the GPU EIR.

Attachments:

Appendix A – References

Appendix B – Summary of Determinations and Mitigation within the Final Environmental Impact Report, County of San Diego General Plan Update, SCH # 2002111067

Appendix A

The following is a list of project specific technical studies used to support the analysis of each potential environmental effect:

ASM Affiliates, Jerry Schaefer, Ph.D. (September 2015). Class III Cultural Resources Survey for the Terrace Hill Drive Project, Unincorporated Lakeside, San Diego County, California. Project Number PDS2015-TM-5599.

LDN Consulting, Jeremy Loudon (April 2015). Preliminary Noise Study, Terrace Hill TM Residential Development.

REC Consultants, Elyssa Robertson (June 2015). Biological Resources Letter Report for the Terrace Hill Drive Project, APN: 404-330-30; Prepared for the County of San Diego.

REC Consultants, Bruce A. Robertson (October 2016). Drainage Study for Terrace Hill Drive, El Cajon, CA 92020.

REC Consultants, Bruce A. Robertson (January 2017). County of San Diego Priority Development Project (PDP) SWQMP, Terrace Hill Drive.

For a complete list of technical studies, references, and significance guidelines used to support the analysis of the General Plan Update Final Certified Program EIR, dated August 3, 2011, please visit the County's website at:

[http://www.sandiegocounty.gov/content/dam/sdc/pds/gpupdate/docs/BOS_Aug2011/EIR/FEIR_5.00 - References_2011.pdf](http://www.sandiegocounty.gov/content/dam/sdc/pds/gpupdate/docs/BOS_Aug2011/EIR/FEIR_5.00_-_References_2011.pdf)

Appendix B

A Summary of Determinations and Mitigation within the Final Environmental Impact Report, County of San Diego General Plan Update, SCH # 2002111067 is available on the Planning and Development Services website at:

http://www.sdcounty.ca.gov/pds/gpupdate/GPU_FEIR_Summary_15183_Reference.pdf